

|                          |                      |                      |  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | Application No.      | Applicant(s)         |  |
|                          | 09/996,064           | CONTRACTOR, SUNIL H. |  |
|                          | Examiner<br>Karen Le | Art Unit<br>2642     |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Karen Le. (3) Mike baldauff.  
 (2) Ahmad Matar. (4) Leonard Hope.

Date of Interview: 17 June 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Savaglio (U.S. Patent 6,415,019).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Ahmad Matar  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Applicant argued that Savaglio (U.S. Patent 6,415,019) did not teach the use of an STP (Signal transfer point) and also argued that the location database 18 in Savaglio is not in the AIN network (the previous office action will be withdrawn and a new office action will be forth coming.)



AHMAD MATAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600